

REMARKS

Claims 1-28 remain pending in the present application. Claim 1 has been amended. Claims 24-28 are new. Basis for the amendments and new claims can be found throughout the specification, claims and drawings originally filed.

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Applicants would like to thank Examiner Ford for the courtesies extended to Applicants' representative in relation to the discussion of the above referenced patent application. Applicants proposed to define the blowers as being in series rather than being in parallel as is disclosed in the cited prior art. Examiner Ford agreed that this definition distinguishes over the cited prior art.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-5, 9-11 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Ruger, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,619,862). Claims 1, 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over DENSO assigned patent USP 6,196,308 to Halligan.

In amended independent Claim 1 of the present application, the heat exchange unit performs heat exchange with air blown by the main blower. The case accommodating the heat exchange unit has first and second passages into which conditioned air after being heat exchanged in the heat exchange unit is blown by the main blower. That is, the main blower causes the conditioned air to flow in both the first

and second passages. In addition, the sub-blower blows conditioned air in the second passage that has an air flow resistance larger than the first passage. The sub-blower is located downstream of the main blower with respect to a flow direction of air blown by the main blower. Accordingly, in the case where the air flow resistance of the second passage is larger than that of the first passage, the flow amount of air passing through the second passage can be effectively increased using the sub-blower.

Ruger, et al. ('862) and Halligan ('308) each describe two blowers. However, the two blowers of those documents are located in parallel with respect to the flow direction of air. Therefore, the arrangement structure of the two blowers is completely different from that of the present application which has the blowers in series. In addition, because both of the blowers can independently introduce air from the heat exchanger unit, the problem described in the present application does not exist. Neither of the blowers in Ruger, et al. or Halligan is located downstream of the other blower in an air flow direction of air blown by the other blower as is now defined in amended Claim 1.

Thus, Applicants believe that Claim 1, as amended, patentably distinguishes over the art of record. Likewise, Claims 2-5, 9-12 and 16, which ultimately depend from Claim 1, are also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ruger as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of DENSO's JP 61-89114. Claim 6 ultimately depends from Claim 1. As discussed above, Claim 1 has been amended and

is now believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Thus, Claim 6 is also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJOINDER

Applicants respectfully request rejoinder of withdrawn Claims 7, 8, 13-15 and 17-23.

NEW CLAIMS

New Claims 24-27 are dependent claims which Applicants believe properly further limit Claim 1 to define the relative locations of the blowers. New Claim 28 is a new independent claim which defines the blowers' relative locations. Applicants believe that new Claims 24-28 read on the elected species.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 10, 2006

By: 

Michael J. Schmidt, 34,007

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MJS/pmg